

## REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The specification has been amended so as to correct the informalities observed by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Objection is deemed to have been overcome.

The drawings were objected to as including new matter. A new set of formal drawings has been provided as an Appendix hereto that are a clean version of the original-filed drawings. Thus, the objection to the drawings is deemed to be overcome.

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Claim 7 does not contradict claim 1 in that more than one UI is possible, and that a UI and a VP can co-exist on the same computer platform. See Fig. 1, page 2, first paragraph. Also, VP characteristic information is transmitted to the host in the form of an executable program. Claim 1 has been amended such that claim 7 does not contradict claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is deemed to be overcome.

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke et al ("Ludtke") in view of Koyama and Robinson. Claim 1 has been amended, and new claims 12-20 have been added, so as to

Appl. No. 09/872,934  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office action of December 02, 2004

distinguish over this prior art. In particular, claim 1 now requires:

sending vision processor (VP) characteristic information over the network from a VP of the heterogeneous set of VPs to the at least one host, the VP characteristic information including **VP hardware characteristics and VP software characteristics.**

Ludtke teaches “self-describing information relating to a graphical representation of the device, the controls available on the device, and the interface required to access those controls” See Abstract. By contrast, Applicant’s invention sends VP hardware and software information.

New claims 12-20 specifically claim the various VP hardware and VP software information. This type of information can be quite detailed, and is clearly different from the type of information that Ludtke teaches. Moreover, Koyoma does not repair this deficiency, nor is there any suggestion to combine Koyama with Ludtke. Similarly, Robinson does not repair this deficiency, nor is there any suggestion to combine Robinson with Ludtke.

Appl. No. 09/872,934  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office action of December 02, 2004

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to phone the undersigned attorney to further the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/2/05

R. Weinzimmer

Russ Weinzimmer  
Registration No. 36,717  
Attorney for Applicants

P.O. Box 862  
Wilton, NH 03086

Tel: 603-654-5670  
Fax: 603-654-3556

Appl. No. 09/872,934  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office action of December 02, 2004

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The formal drawings provided in the Appendix, provided herewith, have been formalized so as to reduce the form to a transparent outline so that the display can be read more easily. The form represents an image of a part that is being inspected by a machine vision system of the invention. The part is visible in outline through a partially transparent spreadsheet grid that is populated with machine vision data.